

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 4, 5 and 11-16 are currently being amended.

This amendment changes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-16 are now pending in this application.

**Information Disclosure Statement**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the references cited in the information disclosure statements submitted on April 30, 2004 and September 5, 2007.

**Priority**

Applicant thanks the Examiner acknowledging receipt of the priority papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,181,503 ("Choi"). In response, Applicant amends claims 1, 4, 5 and 11-16 to further define the invention and respectfully traverses the rejection for the reasons set forth below.

Applicant relies on M.P.E.P. § 2131, entitled "Anticipation – Application of 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), (b) and (e)" which states, "a claim is anticipated only if each and every element set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Applicant respectfully submits that Choi does not describe each and every element of the claims.

Independent claims 1, 4, 11, 12, 14 and 15 are directed toward a method and apparatus for detecting an IP address of a device connected to a subnet network. The subnet network may include a DNS server. For example, the apparatus of claim 1 includes "a search IP

address detector for detecting at least one search IP address from IP addresses which are selected every a predetermined number of IP addresses as a unit from possible IP addresses on the subnet network; an IP address detector for detecting an IP address of a target device on the subnet network from the at least one search IP address detected; and a controller for terminating a subnet network information detection operation either when all possible IP addresses on the subnet network have been selected or when the IP address of the target device has been detected” (emphasis added).

As illustrated above, the claimed network information detection apparatus and method is capable of detecting a DNS server or router in a subnet. Accordingly, the claimed invention is capable of automatically and rapidly acquiring network information without needing any server functions for providing network information.

In contrast, Choi is directed to a method and apparatus for searching for a DNS server in an outernet for a network in which a DNS server is not present. (*See* Col. 1, lines 15-17.) Choi specifically distinguishes its method and apparatus from methods used for detecting a DNS present in a subnet in column 1, lines 55-62. The apparatus disclosed in Choi includes a first outernet DNS searching unit, a second outernet searching unit included in a DNS server and a third outernet searching unit included in a router. (*See* Col. 2, lines 5-25.) The first outernet DNS searching unit is configured to send a search message to an outernet. (*See id.*) Thus, Choi does not teach, disclose or suggest the claimed invention.

Specifically, Choi fails to disclose or suggest a method and apparatus for identifying the IP address of a target device on a subnet. Further, Choi fails to disclose an apparatus or method configures to terminate a subnet network information detection operation either when all possible IP addresses on the subnet network have been selected or when the IP address of the target device has been detected. M.P.E.P. § 2131 states that “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Here, Choi fails to disclose teach each and every limitation in the requisite detail.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn and independent claims 1, 4, 11, 12, 14 and 15 be allowed. Further, claims 2, 3, 5-10, 13 and 16 depend from one of claims 1, 4, 11, 12, 14 or 15 and should also be allowed for the reasons set forth above.

Finally, if this rejection of the claims is maintained, the examiner is respectfully requested to point out where the above-mentioned features are disclosed in Choi.

**Conclusion**

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.


The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date January 7, 2007 (Monday)

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 945-6014  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By  Reg. No. 59,396

 George C. Beck  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 38,072